

REMARKS

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks and amendments. Claims 1, 9, 19, 20, 29, and 39 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1-13 and 15-39 are pending in the application.

I. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 4-9, 12, 13, 15-19 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,188,318 issued to Spisak (hereinafter “Spisak”). To establish an anticipation rejection the Examiner must show that the cited reference teaches each element of a claim.

Claim 1 as currently amended is as follows:

1. (Currently Amended) A system for navigating within a graphical user interface without using a pointing device, comprising:
 - a set of one or more keyboard shortcuts comprising at least one key, each keyboard shortcut specifying an action to perform within a graphical user interface which is executed upon input of each key in the keyboard shortcut and at least one key corresponding to a semantically-meaningful hyperlink within Web content, wherein at least one of the one or more keyboard shortcuts causes scrolling of the Web content to occur and fetching of additional web content when scrolling reaches a predetermined location in the Web content, and further wherein the Web content comprises at least one intervening hyperlink, and the at least one key corresponding to the semantically-meaningful hyperlink providing navigation to skip selection of the at least one intervening hyperlink; and
 - a Web browser providing navigation within the graphical user interface, comprising:
 - an output component providing the Web content on a view within the graphical user interface and including a graphical pointer indicating a location within the view; and
 - an input component intercepting at least one key input by a user and mapping the intercepted key to one keyboard shortcut, and executing the action specified by the keyboard shortcut and updating the view within the Web content relative to the graphical pointer. (emphasis added)

As set forth above, Claim 1, as amended, states that at least one of the keyboard shortcuts causes scrolling of the Web content to occur and fetching of additional web content (e.g., another page of search results) when scrolling reaches a predetermined location in the Web content.

Applicant respectfully submits that Spisak does not disclose a keyboard shortcut that causes both scrolling through web content and fetching of additional web content such as another page of search results. While Spisak shows a scroll bar in Figure 3, it does not teach, mention, nor disclose a keyboard shortcut that causes both scrolling through web content and fetching of additional web content. Therefore, in view of this, Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention as claimed in Claim 1 is not anticipated by Spisak.

In regard to the remaining independent claims, namely, Claim 9, 19, 20, 29, and 39, this claim recites analogous limitations to those in claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed in connection with claim 1, Spisak fails to teach each element of claims 9, 19, 20, 29, and 39. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9, 19, 20, 29, and 39 are respectfully requested.

Furthermore, in regard to claims 9 and 39, the Examiner simply stated on pages 4 and 5 of the Final Office Action that each of these claims “is similar in scope to claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale [*sic*].” However, claims 9 and 39 recite elements that are not included in claim 1. For example, the Examiner failed to allege where in Spisak that the elements of “at least one key corresponding to a cached copy of a Web page associated with the semantically-meaningful hyperlink, the cached copy provided by a search engine,” as recited in claims 9 and 39 (and not in claim 1) are taught. Therefore, if the Examiner maintains the rejection, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner point to the portion of Spisak that allegedly teaches these elements. As a result, Spisak fails to teach each element of claims 9 and 39. In addition, claims 12, 13, and 15-18 are patentable over Spisak because each of these claims depends on claim 9. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9, 12, 13, 15-18, and 39 are respectfully requested.

II. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 3, 10, 11, and 20-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Spisak in view of Screen Dumps of Microsoft Internet Explorer 6.0 (hereinafter “IE”).

In regard to claims 2 and 3, these claims depend from base claim 1 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Therefore for at least the reasons mentioned in connection with claim 1, Spisak fails to teach or suggest each element of claims 2 and 3. Further, the Examiner has not relied upon and the Applicants are unable to discern the portion of IE that teaches the missing limitations. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Spisak in view of IE fails to teach or suggest each element of claims 2 and 3. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2 and 3 are respectfully requested.

In regard to claims 10 and 11, these claims depend from base claim 9 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Therefore, for at least the reasons mentioned in connection with claim 9, Spisak fails to teach or suggest each element of claims 10 and 11. In addition, IE fails to cure these deficiencies. The Examiner has not relied upon and the Applicants are unable to discern the portion of IE that teaches the missing limitations. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Spisak in view of IE fails to teach or suggest each element of claims 10 and 11. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10 and 11 are respectfully requested.

In regard to claim 20, as an initial matter, the Examiner is not entitled to rephrase the claim language in an attempt to bolster his argument. For example, the Examiner alleged on page 7 of the Final Office Action that Spisak teaches the elements of “the cached copy provided in response to a search request.” In contrast, that is not what is recited in the claim language: i.e., “the cached copy provided *by a search engine*” (emphasis added). The Applicants conclude that the Examiner attempted to improperly allege that “a search request” is equivalent with “a search engine,” as recited in the claim. On the other hand, Spisak mentions the search request (which the Examiner mischaracterized as the “search engine”) to illustrate one example of *keys typed by a user* (which is clearly not “a search engine”) during the course of using the Web page. See Spisak, column 4, lines 42-46. However, this example, without more, fails to teach “the cached copy provided by a search engine,” as recited in the claim. Consequently, the Examiner has failed to point to “a search engine” that provides a cached copy of the Web page. For at least this reason, claim 20 is patentable over the cited art. Notwithstanding the Examiner’s improper rephrasing of the claim language, the Applicants present the following discussion to establish additional reasons that claim 20 is not obvious in view of the cited art.

Claim 20, among other limitations, recites the elements of “at least one key corresponding to a cached copy of a Web page associated with the semantically-meaningful hyperlink, the cached copy provided by a search engine.” The portion of Spisak relied upon by the Examiner fails to teach or suggest these elements. Instead, Spisak simply states that previously displayed screens may be cached, which may be stored in RAM or disk. See Spisak, column 2, lines 21-24. This fails to teach the element of “a search engine,” let alone, the elements “a cached copy of a Web page associated with the semantically-meaningful hyperlink, the cached copy provided by a search engine,” as recited in the claim. On the other hand, the Examiner stated on page 7 of the Final Office Action that “Spisak does not explicitly disclose the search request implemented [*sic*] by a search engine.” Again, the Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner is improperly rephrasing what the Applicants claim because a “search request” is not even recited in the claim language as alleged by the Examiner. In addition, IE fails to cure the above deficiencies. The portions of IE relied upon by the Examiner, namely Fig. 6-9, are simply various screen shots from the Internet Explorer web browser that, by themselves, fail to teach or suggest a search engine, let alone, the elements of “the cached copy provided by a search engine,” as recited in the claim. Lastly, the Examiner cited “Google text-box” on page 7 of the Final Office Action without pointing to the portion of IE that teaches a “Google text-box.” The Applicants respectfully submit that the “Google text-box” is not even taught in Fig. 6-9 of IE, which the Examiner has relied upon. Therefore, in view of at least the foregoing reasons, Spisak in view of IE fails to teach or suggest each element of claim 20. In addition, claims 21-28 are not obvious over Spisak in view of IE because of their dependencies on claim 20. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 20-28 are respectfully requested.

In regard to claim 29, this claim recites analogous limitations to those in claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed in connection with claim 1, Spisak fails to teach each element of claim 29. In addition, IE fails to cure these deficiencies. The Examiner has not relied upon and the Applicants are unable to discern the portion of IE that teaches the missing limitations. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Spisak in view of IE fails to teach or suggest each element of claim 29. Moreover, claims 30-38 are not obvious over the cited art because of their dependencies on claim 29. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 29-38 are respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record, and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 11/19, 2007



Michael J. Mallie Reg. No. 36,591

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING:

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on November 19, 2007.

 11-19-07
Joyce Klein November 19, 2007